UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . Criminal No. 1:19cr334-4

.

vs. . Alexandria, Virginia

January 19, 2021

ERIC YONG WOO, . 10:28 a.m.

.

Defendant.

•

.

TRANSCRIPT OF ARRAIGNMENT/MOTION HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONIE M. BRINKEMA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
(Via VTC/ZoomGov Videoconference)

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE GOVERNMENT: DAVID A. PETERS, AUSA

United States Attorney's Office

2100 Jamieson Avenue Alexandria, VA 22314

FOR THE DEFENDANT: PATRICK A. MULLIN, ESQ.

The Law Offices of Patrick A.

Mullin

45 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 2000

New York, NY 10111

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: ANNELIESE J. THOMSON, RDR, CRR

U.S. District Court, Third Floor

401 Courthouse Square Alexandria, VA 22314

(703)299-8595

(Pages 1 - 19)

COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION OF STENOGRAPHIC NOTES

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (Defendant present via VTC video.) 3 THE CLERK: Criminal Case 19-334-4, United States of America v. Eric Yong Woo. Would counsel please note their 4 5 appearances for the record. MR. PETERS: Good morning, Your Honor. David Peters 6 for the United States. 7 8 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Peters. 9 And for the defendant? 10 MR. MULLIN: Your Honor, good morning. I'm Patrick 11 Mullin, appearing on behalf of Mr. Woo. 12 THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Woo is here by Zoom. 13 I want to know, Mr. Woo, whether you have any objection to 14 appearing remotely today. 15 Mr. Woo, we can't hear you. There's no sound. 16 THE DEFENDANT: No. 17 THE COURT: No, all right. 18 THE DEFENDANT: No. 19 THE COURT: And, counsel, have you discussed with 20 your client his right to be in person in the courthouse? 21 MR. MULLIN: Yes, Judge. We spoke by phone a few 22 days ago, and he was aware of that, and he has no objection to 23 proceeding in this fashion. 24 THE COURT: All right, that's fine. 25 Then let me ask you, counsel, have you had a chance

- 1 to go over the indictment yourself?
- 2 MR. MULLIN: Yes, I have, Judge.
- 3 THE COURT: And to review the indictment with your
- 4 | client?
- 5 MR. MULLIN: Yes. Again, we discussed it a few days
- 6 ago. Yes.
- 7 THE COURT: Do you wish to have a formal or an
- 8 informal arraignment?
- 9 MR. MULLIN: Judge, we waive a reading of the
- 10 indictment, Judge.
- 11 THE COURT: I assume you're entering a plea of not
- 12 guilty?
- MR. MULLIN: Yes, we are.
- 14 THE COURT: And are you requesting a trial by the
- 15 bench or by a jury?
- MR. MULLIN: By jury, Your Honor.
- 17 | THE COURT: All right. As I'm sure Mr. Peters has
- 18 explained to you, we've previously found that this case does
- 19 | qualify as a complex case because of the number of defendants,
- 20 | the amount of evidence that is obtained from foreign sources,
- 21 the need for much of it to be translated.
- In addition, of course, we're also struggling with
- 23 | the COVID-19 situation, and I'm sure you're aware that the
- 24 standing general order that's just been issued by the chief
- 25 judge has postponed any jury trials through the month of

February, so we're looking at March as the earliest time in which this case could be set for trial.

I believe also, Mr. Peters, is there not a status conference currently set for next Tuesday?

MR. PETERS: There is, Your Honor, and I think the intention was to, I hope, set a trial date at that, at that conference, and so insofar as today's hearing is concerned, perhaps we could reserve setting a trial date today in lieu of next week.

THE COURT: We have to do that because there are multiple defendants; and therefore, we have to set the trial date when all defendants can be present. We'll most likely have to decide how we do that. It probably will be done remotely again because of the number of defendants. Some are in Alexandria, and some are at Warsaw. I don't know if any are at Rappahanock, but we have people spread out among various prisons, in part because of the COVID situation.

Is there any objection to proceeding in that fashion?

MR. PETERS: Not from the government.

MR. MULLIN: Not from the defendant, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. So then it's scheduled, I believe, for 10:00 next Tuesday; is that right? If not, it probably needs to be at 10:00 because my understanding is we can't do any videoconferences -- that may be a problem.

How many defendants are left in this case at this

- 1 | point, Mr. Peters, besides Mr. Woo? I know we have Mr. Li.
- 2 Now, who else do we have?
- MR. PETERS: Not counting Mr. Woo, Your Honor, in
- 4 | custody right now there are four defendants, and one remains a
- 5 fugitive.
- 6 THE COURT: All right. So we have a total of five
- 7 defendants that need to be present at the arraignment next week
- 8 or the trial, the trial-setting date -- status conference next
- 9 week.
- 10 MR. PETERS: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: Yeah. We're going to have to look at
- 12 | what time we do that, all right? As I said, I know the jail
- 13 | cannot do VTC -- Alexandria Jail cannot do VTC before 10:00.
- 14 Because Mr. Woo is at Northern Neck, I think they start even
- 15 later, and I currently have an 11:00 civil matter. So I'm not
- 16 yet sure what time on the 26th, counsel, we'll be able to set
- 17 | this. We'll let you know as soon as we've worked it out.
- 18 Are you pretty much available all day on the 26th?
- 19 MR. MULLIN: Your Honor, I am.
- 20 | THE COURT: All right. That's fine, Mr. Mullin. I'm
- 21 sure Mr. Peters is. I'm not worried about that.
- 22 So just be on standby. We're going to have to
- 23 | coordinate this with several other attorneys. If you haven't
- 24 already been in touch with some of the other attorneys, you
- 25 | ought to try to, you know, communicate with them.

Let me take care of a couple of other preliminary 1 2 matters. Mr. Woo, I want to repeat what I believe Judge 3 Anderson already did with you but explain to you that under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5(f) and the Due Process 4 5 Protections Act, I am advising the government that it must adhere to the disclosure obligations set forth in Brady v. 6 7 Marvland and --8 I can't hear. THE DEFENDANT: 9 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 10 THE DEFENDANT: I just interrupted. I cannot hear 11 what you said before. 12 THE COURT: We'll try again. I'm re-advising you of 13 the matters which Judge Anderson explained to you during your 14 earlier hearings last week, and that is, that under Federal 15 Rule of Criminal Procedure 5(f) and the Due Process Protections Act, the government is required to disclose to you all 16 17 information that's required under Brady v. Maryland and its 18 progeny, and that case, Brady v. Maryland, requires the 19 government to provide any possible exculpatory evidence, any 20 evidence that might tend to show that you are innocent of the 21 charge or which might assist in your sentencing situation. 22 Do you understand that? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 24 THE COURT: All right. And if the government fails 25 to comply with that requirement, it could result in serious

consequences, including vacating any conviction that might 1 2 occur as well as disciplinary action against the prosecutors. Do you understand that? 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 5 THE COURT: All right. I also have in court a protective order which has been, as I understand it, 6 7 Mr. Mullin, agreed to by you on behalf of your client as well 8 as a discovery order. Is that correct? 9 MR. MULLIN: That is correct, Judge. 10 THE COURT: All right. So both of those -- all of 11 those orders will be entered this morning. All right. I've 12 made a finding that this is a complex case. 13 The last issue, I believe, that's on the agenda is 14 your motion for reconsideration of the bond situation. The 15 magistrate judge in California who did the initial appearance for your client and the initial detention hearing found that 16 17 your client posed a significant risk of flight. 18

THE DEFENDANT: I can't hear anything.

19 THE COURT: You can't hear again? Mr. Woo, you can't

20 hear?

22

23

24

25

21 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I can't hear.

THE COURT: All right. The last issue we have to look at today is your motion for the Court to reconsider the detention order that was entered in California.

THE DEFENDANT: Um-hum.

THE COURT: Did you hear that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I heard it.

THE COURT: All right.

that?

4 THE DEFENDANT: I just heard that.

THE COURT: All right. The magistrate judge in California found that there is no condition or set of conditions of release that would reasonably assure your appearance in this district for further court proceedings.

Today I can conduct a de novo review of that decision. I have read all the papers that have been submitted -- did you hear

THE DEFENDANT: I just hear whatever you said, you reconsider the motion in California.

THE COURT: I can reconsider it. So, Mr. Mullin, you've seen the government's response to your motion in which the government points out that your client has used or attempted to use fake identification, and they've sent the Court a copy of this People's Republic of China passport in the name of Nan Li.

Do you want to address that?

MR. MULLIN: Certainly, Judge. In terms of the government's position, a couple of things. First of all, at worst, the government's position is that my client was a courier, that is, someone who carried money for folks that were up to no good, Judge, and while one of the factors that is

- 1 considered under the bail statute is the weight of the evidence
- 2 against somebody, here this is not someone who is alleged to be
- 3 | a leader of any organization, someone who is involved in drug
- 4 trafficking, as the other defendants are, so I think that
- 5 factor weighs towards giving bail to my client.
- 6 In terms of the actual passport, my understanding of
- 7 | the name on that passport, that that name, Nan Li, is something
- 8 that my client had going back to China when he was a third
- 9 child born in a family where the government only allowed one or
- 10 | two folks. That was the policy back then in effect, so that
- 11 | that name was one that was given to him back then.
- The import of the passport itself or any other
- document that alleges to have been fraudulently put together,
- 14 | I -- we're not in a position in any way to address it
- 15 otherwise.
- 16 MR. PETERS: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt. I
- 17 | can't hear Mr. Mullin at all.
- THE COURT: Yeah. Mr. Mullin, you're going in and
- 19 out. What are you -- what are you using to communicate with
- 20 us?
- 21 MR. MULLIN: An iPad.
- 22 THE COURT: That may be the problem. Your voice is
- 23 | coming and going. I'm not sure even if my court reporter has
- 24 | been able to get all of it, but --
- MR. MULLIN: Do you want me to call in, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Right now, what you just said was crystal clear. Maybe just don't move. Freeze yourself in position, and keep talking where you are. Maybe that will solve the problem.

MR. MULLIN: Okay. Let's try it again.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MULLIN: All right. Your Honor, as to the passport itself, the name on that passport -- can you hear me?

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MULLIN: Okay. The name on that passport is a name that I am advised was given to my client at birth with regard to the policy in China where only one or two children were allowed to be born, and he is the youngest of a three-children family. Otherwise, in terms of the actual document itself, at this point, there's not much that I can address that, but I think more importantly, what we're looking to do here is to have bail set for him with a third-party custodian.

He would be living with his parents. He would be living with his wife and his children. He would be subject to electronic monitoring. He would be subject to computer monitoring. There would be every assurance that he's going nowhere.

I've already sent an e-mail over to Pretrial Services with a phone number that they can contact his family to verify

information with regard to his parents serving as a third-party supervisor.

Otherwise, Judge, in reading the government's submission, he is at worst a courier for money. He's not a leader of any organization. He's not charged with any kind of drug conspiracy, where there would be a presumption of his, his remaining incarcerated. According to page 2 of the report from California, the bond report, when he was arrested, he did not have any false documentation on him.

Judge, there's every -- and he's also gone through very, very difficult times while incarcerated. I mean, it's taken over three months to get him to Virginia from California, and during that time, he received COVID-19. According to the California report, he has Hepatitis B, so he is in that risk category.

The government takes the position that he had COVID once; he can't get it again. Judge, that's not my understanding of how that works. So he is certainly at risk to get sick again while in jail.

And under the circumstances here, Judge, I would submit to you that he is a candidate for the third-party custodian supervision until trial takes place.

THE COURT: Well, one concern I have about the custodians, my understanding is the defendant's parents are both in their seventies, do not speak English, and are

essentially dependent upon him. Those indications would suggest that they would not be the type of custodian who would be able to exercise sufficient control and communicate any issues to probation.

And one of the reasons you gave why your client needs to be home is that his wife also does not speak English, and so I don't know how any of those three could be even considered adequate custodians because part of the job of a custodian is to be able to communicate immediately any potential violations that might be occurring.

But the second problem as I see this record is that your client has an extensive history of travel, especially to Mexico, to China, and to other countries, and, for example, apparently he has a Chinese passport and he's a Chinese citizen, and were he to go to China, whether we could ever extradite him would be a significant problem.

The flight risk, I think, is very real here, and even though your client himself is not charged with a presumption offense, he is included in an indictment that addresses significant international drug dealing, and that his role in this overall operation was to assist with the laundering of the proceeds, which is obviously the fuel that enables the drug business to go on.

So although it's not a presumption case, it is a serious one, and the government has in their papers pointed to

fairly significant evidence which they argue shows it's a strong case. Your client has been indicted, so that already establishes a minimum level of probable cause to believe that he may have committed the offense for which he is charged.

The, the flight risk is the concern that the Court has, and I'm not satisfied that there's any new evidence. If anything, I think the evidence may be stronger that there is this flight risk.

But let me hear from Mr. Peters. Mr. Peters?

MR. PETERS: Your Honor, I'd like to respond first to a few things that, that Mr. Mullin said. First off, we do not take the position that he can't get COVID again. We take the position that he's had it. The CDC has communicated that those who have had COVID-19 have developed antibodies which would aid in preventing him from getting at least the strain he's already suffered from.

We've made significant representations in our, in our pleading with respect to what the Northern Neck Jail is doing, what their current numbers are. We think, you know, while it's not ideal, they have the situation well in hand.

To the extent that Mr. Mullin says that the evidence at best shows that Mr. Woo is a courier, I think that's a misrepresentation as well of what we've alleged at least in this pleading. We've set forth evidence that we intend to prove at trial that he helped courier money on that occasion.

Also, the travel to Suriname, we intend to prove, one, happened; we intend to prove the reason for the travel; and we intend to prove that in the broader role of conspiracy, that the use of false identities, false travel documents loom large in the way that this group of, of codefendants perpetrated their crime.

So I think it's not entirely accurate to say that his involvement is merely as a courier. He indeed couriered money, and we're going to prove that. He did other things as well that are directly related to the conspiracy. I think his level of culpability goes considerably further than what Mr. Mullin has represented. And, you know, I think once we have an opportunity to provide discovery, we can properly hear (inaudible).

As far as, you know, the existence of a third-party custodian, as the Court pointed out, the proposed custodians are 70, don't speak English, are not from this country, and are simply not acceptable, but we would take the position that nobody would be acceptable.

If the Court were to allow Mr. Woo to return to Los Angeles, mere miles from the Mexico border, the amount of border crossings that I understand Mr. Woo has had just simply between the United States and Mexico suggests that it would be simple for him to border that -- to say he had business interests and disappear, and our, our ability to extradite

defendants from Mexico is not, is not zero, but it's not easy, and there's a significant opportunity that he could escape to Mexico and never come back, and if he were to get out of Mexico and into someplace like China, then I think our chances for ever expediting him are practically zero at that point.

He has no ties to this area. There's nobody here who could supervise him. So ostensibly, by releasing him to the custody of the third-party custodian, we would be consenting to him returning to southern California, where, one, he committed a significant portion of criminal activity; and two, that as I stated, he could easily escape out of the country, and we would stand no chance of ever retrieving him and bringing him back, back before this Court.

Also, as the Court pointed out, although Mr. Woo is not charged in Counts 1 or 2 of this conspiracy, the evidence is going to amply demonstrate that the money involved is the government's, and although the defendant is not charged in the (inaudible), I think what we're going to show is that there is significant evidence that he knew that. Whether that becomes an issue at, you know, potentially at sentencing would be something for the Court's consideration.

So again, the nature of the conduct, the breadth of the evidence, the risk of flight, the connection with transnational criminal organizations, the use of -- the prolific use of false identities, I think all militate in favor

1 of continued confinement in this case pending trial.

THE COURT: All right. Well --

3 MR. MULLIN: Judge, could I be heard?

4 THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. MULLIN: Thank you, Judge. First, in terms of the age of Mr. Woo's client, I would submit that being in your seventies does not mean that you cannot be effective. Having been someone who just turned 71, you know, people who are in their seventies can still be active and vigilant and so forth, so I don't think that's really a factor.

Secondly, in terms of the communication as to Mr. Woo, there is at least one family member who I've spoken to who, who could remain available should any issues arise to serve as kind of a liaison to the Probation Department or Pretrial Services, and we certainly could look to set something up like that if that were to arise.

And I think the flip side is he's going to be living not only with his parents but with his wife and his children.

I mean, here's someone who will have no incentive to leave all of that, to leave, especially if the parents take seriously, as they will, their obligation here to serve as the custodian.

In terms of the border issue, Los Angeles is not on the Mexico border. If it was San Diego, that would be closer, but Los Angeles is not. And the reality of today's world is that it is getting tougher and tougher for folks to travel from

one country to another. I know China has imposed great
barriers for folks traveling over there. So it's not as it was

before the pandemic. That's an issue that arises as well.

And I, and I would submit to Your Honor that the reasons for allowing him, him being my client, to be in this, it would be like a cocoon that he would be in -- I mean, he's going to have electronic monitoring; he's going to have computer monitoring; he's going to have folks who are responsible -- outweighs any of these other factors raised here.

So again, I would ask Your Honor under those circumstances to allow him to, to -- for bail under these circumstances that I've laid out.

THE COURT: All right. Well, counsel, I've heard the arguments of all of you, and I've looked at the papers, and I'm not satisfied -- I'm satisfied that the government has more than met its burden in this case, where there is already a probable cause finding that supports the charge in the indictment, that no condition or set of conditions of release would reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant in this district for the trial or any other court proceedings.

I am not satisfied that because of the extreme amount of international travel which this defendant has and the nature of the offense and the allegations -- I recognize you've offered an explanation but I don't -- I'm not satisfied it's

sufficient -- that this passport, which is apparently not in
his true name, has an innocent explanation. Plus, the
government has indicated that the use and one of the modus
operandi of this operation was to use falsified identification.

In my view, that makes the defendant a flight risk, and therefore, I am denying the motion. And we'll see you-all sometime next week for an arraignment, and we'll try to get you a trial date as soon as possible, but I -- because some of the defendants in this case have been in custody over a year.

At the same time, because -- until this virus gets under control, we are limited even when we do begin jury trials to how we can try them. In other words, we can't try multiple trials at a time in this courthouse, especially a five-defendant case, and so I cannot guarantee you that there'll be a trial in the near future, unlike it was in the pre-COVID era. We'll do the best we can to get you a reasonably early trial date, but I wouldn't expect anything too soon.

So that concludes this proceeding. We'll see you-all some point next week. Thank you.

MR. PETERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Which were all the proceedings

had at this time.)

1	CERTIFICATE OF THE REPORTER
2	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of
3	the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
4	
5	
6	/s/
7	Anneliese J. Thomson
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	